



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/098,676 | 03/15/2002 | Jeremy P.J. Hughes | GB920010032US1 | 5691 |
| 46320 7590 07/17/2007 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487 | | | EXAMINER SHAW, YIN CHEN | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2135 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 07/17/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/098,676 | Applicant(s) HUGHES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Yin-Chen Shaw | Art Unit 2135 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This written action is responding to the amendment dated on 04/24/2007.
2. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 20-21, and 25-26 have been amended. All other claims are as original.
3. Claims 1-34 have been submitted for examination.
4. Claims 1-34 have been examined and rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 16-18, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458) and further in view of Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778).

a. Referring to Claims 1, 17, 33, and 34:

As per Claim 1, Muret et al. disclose a method of controlling access to information in a distributed data processing system having:

a server for storing said information, wherein said server further comprises a logging tool for creating a log file [(lines 64-67, Col. 3; lines 1-2, Col. 4; lines 16-22, Col. 2 , Col. 2 from Muret et al.)], and a client computer comprising an application program for controlling a

software agent, wherein said software agent requests said information from said server **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.)]**, said method comprising the steps of:

identifying a software agent **[(line 65, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said identifying step, storing all requests from said identified software agent in said log file **[(lines 44-47, Co. 8 and lines 45-52, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said storing step, analysing said log file **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**;

in response to said analysing step, monitoring behaviour of said identified software agent **[(lines 16-22, Col. 2 , Col. 2 and lines 28-31, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**, and

Muret et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitation of the claim. However, Obata et al. disclose in response to said monitoring step, invoking at least one of a plurality of pre-defined rules to control said behaviour of said identified software agent **[(lines 1-6 of [0007] from Obata et al.)]**. Muret et al. and Obata et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. with Obata et al. to have rules for controlling the software crawler since one would have been motivated to optimize a Web

crawler's use of computer resources when performing adaptive incremental Web crawls to maintain the synchronization (lines 4-7 of [0010] from Obata et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. with Obata et al. to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

As per Claim 17, it is a system claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

As per Claim 33, it is a distributed data processing system claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

As per Claim 34, it is a computer readable medium claim that corresponds to the method Claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 1 above.

b. Referring to Claims 2 and 18:

As per Claim 2, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said information is represented within any number of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 7-14, Col. 4 from Muret et al.)]**, each of said any number of a plurality of web pages comprising a

non-visible link [(lines 45-53 and 65-67, Col. 20 and line 1, Col. 21 from Muret et al.)].

As per Claim 18, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 18 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 2. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 2 above.

c. Referring to Claims 16 and 32:

As per Claim 16, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said at least one of a plurality of pre-defined rules controls a plurality of thread priorities associated with said server, wherein at least one of a plurality of threads is associated with a software agent [(lines 49-54, Col. 11; lines 65-67, Col. 22 from Muret et al.) and (lines 1-6 of [0007] from Obata et al.)].

As per Claim 32, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 32 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 16. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 16 above.

6. Claims 3-7, 14-15, 19-23, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458) and Obata et al.

(U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), and further in view of Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826, 594).

a. Referring to Claims 3 and 19:

As per Claim 3, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 2, wherein a software agent requests one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23)]**. Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the identifying step as in Claim 1. However, Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses said identifying step further comprises the steps of: dynamically generating a first unique identifier and dynamically inserting said first unique identifier into a non-visible link associated with said one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 1-6, Col. 14 and lines 26-30, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**, and
determining whether said one of a plurality of web pages is associated with further of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 46-48, Col. 13; lines 26-40, Col. 14; lines 16-25, Col. 15 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic

or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 3.

As per Claim 19, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 19 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 3. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 3 above.

b. Referring to Claims 4 and 20:

As per Claim 4, Muret et al., Obata et al, and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein:

upon said determining step being successful, said first identifier is dynamically inserted into further non-visible links **[(lines 26-30, Col. 14 and lines 42-47, Col. 14 from Petteresn)]**.

As per Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 19 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 20 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 4. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 4 above.

c. Referring to Claims 5 and 21:

As per Claim 5, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 3, wherein upon said determining step not being successful, said identifying step further comprises the steps of:

sending said one of a plurality of web pages to said identified software agent **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 26-40, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said sending step, requesting, from said server by said identified software agent, any number of a plurality of links associated with said one of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 46-52, Col. 13 and lines 26-40, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said requesting step, extracting, by said identified software agent, said any number of a plurality of links **[lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23 from Muret et al.) and (lines 1-6, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**;

in response to said extracting step, passing, by said identified software agent, said any number of a plurality of links to said client application program **[lines 61-66, Col. 22 and lines 1-3, Col. 23; lines 9-13, Col. 19 from Muret et al.)]**, and

in response to said passing step, determining, by said client application program, which of said any number of a plurality of links to display **[(lines 62-67, Col. 5; lines 9-13, Col. 19 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of Claim 19 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 21 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 5. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 5 above.

d. Referring to Claims 6 and 22:

As per Claim 6, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 5, wherein said any number of a plurality of links is displayed within a web browsing session running on said client computer [(lines 62-67, Col. 5; lines 9-13, Col. 19; lines 5-13, Col. 24 from Muret et al.)].

As per Claim 22, the rejection of Claim 21 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 22 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 6. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 6 above.

e. Referring to Claims 7 and 23:

As per Claim 7, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein said analysing step. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses identifying a first value associated with said any number of a plurality of web pages and a second value

associated with said further of a plurality of web pages **[(lines 35-55, Col. 10 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 7.

As per Claim 23, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 23 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 7. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 7 above.

f. Referring to Claims 14 and 30:

As per Claim 14, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 2. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses wherein a second unique identifier is generated and further

inserted into a non-visible link **[(lines 60-61, Col. 13, lines 1-6 and 26-30, Col. 14 from Pettersen)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 14.

As per Claim 30, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 30 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 14. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 14 above.

g. Referring to Claims 15 and 31:

As per Claim 15, Muret et al. and Obata et al. disclose the method according to claim 1. Muret et al. and Obata et al. do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Pettersen discloses wherein said distributed data processing system further

comprises an application server [(lines 34-40, Col. 12 from Pettersen)]. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen since one would have been motivated to insert dynamic or variable type content from a web server into a designated portion of a web page over a distributed electronic network, such as the Internet (lines 3-6, Col. 4 from Pettersen et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al. and Obata et al. with Pettersen to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 15.

As per Claim 31, the rejection of Claim 17 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 31 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 15. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 15 above.

7. Claims 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and further in view of Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,638,314).

- a. Referring to Claims 8 and 24:

As per Claim 8, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 7, wherein said monitoring step further comprises the steps of:

Pettersen further discloses said first and second values in Claim 7. Pettersen does not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Meyerzon et al. disclose utilising said first and second values to generate a third value, wherein said third value is associated with said identified software agent **[(lines 28-48, Col. 10 from Meyerzon et al.)]**, and

utilising said third value and a fourth value associated with said all requests, to associate said first identifier and said identified software agent with a fifth value, wherein said fifth value is associated with a probability **[(lines 45-67, Col. 10; lines 1-5, Col. 13 from Meyerzon et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Meyerzon et al. since one would have been motivated to perform a Web crawl, by retrieving a set of electronic documents and subsequently retrieving additional electronic documents based on addresses specified within each electronic document (lines 22-25, Col. 2 from Meyerzon et

al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Meyerzon et al. to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 8.

As per Claim 24, the rejection of Claim 23 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 24 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 8. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 8 above.

8. Claims 9-10 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and Meyerzon et al. (U.S. Patent 6,638,314), and further in view of Proctor (U.S. Patent 6,530,024).

a. Referring to Claims 9 and 25:

As per Claim 9, Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. disclose the method according to claim 8, wherein said log file is analysed further **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon do not expressly disclose upon said third value being not more than or equal to a first pre-determined threshold. However, Proctor discloses less than or equal to a threshold value **[(lines 7-11, Col. 10 from Proctor)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are

analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor since one would have been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 9.

As per Claim 25, the rejection of Claim 24 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 25 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 9. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 9 above.

b. Referring to Claims 10 and 26:

As per Claim 10, Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. disclose the method according to claim 8, wherein said log file is analysed further **[(lines 5-9, Col. 7 and lines 45-52 and 61-62, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon do not expressly disclose upon said fourth value being not more than or equal to a second pre-determined threshold. However, Proctor discloses less than or equal to a threshold value **[(lines 7-11, Col. 10**

from Proctor)]. Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor since one would have been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen, and Meyerzon et al. with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 10.

As per Claim 26, the rejection of Claim 24 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 26 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 10. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 10 above.

9. Claims 11-13 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret et al. (U.S. Patent 6,792,458), Obata et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0165778), and Pettersen (U.S. Patent 6,826,594), and further in view of Proctor (U.S. Patent 6,530,024).

a. Referring to Claims 11 and 27:

As per Claim 11, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen disclose the method according to claim 7, wherein said identified software agent is associated with a profile, said profile comprising any number of a plurality of data fields unique to said identified software agent, wherein said invoking step further comprises the steps of:

Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen do not expressly disclose the remaining limitations of the claim. However, Proctor discloses associating said any number of a plurality of data fields with said at least one of a plurality of pre-defined rules **[(lines 11-18, Col. 16 from Proctor)]**, and determining whether a pre-defined response needs to be activated, and in response to a successful determining step, activating said pre-defined response **[(lines 51-60, Col. 2 from Proctor)]**. Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen are analogous art because they are from similar technology relating to the web information technology and information crawling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., Pettersen with Proctor since one would have been motivated to adapt security procedures based on computing environment activity (lines 8-9, Col. 1 from Proctor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen with Proctor to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 11.

As per Claim 27, the rejection of Claim 23 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 27 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 11. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 11 above.

b. Referring to Claims 12 and 28:

As per Claim 12, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen, and Proctor disclose the method according to claim 11, wherein said log file further stores an address associated with a software agent and a name associated with said software agent **[(lines 58-65, Col. 6 and lines 61-67, Col. 22 from Muret et al.)]**.

As per Claim 28, the rejection of Claim 27 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 28 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 12. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 12 above.

c. Referring to Claims 13 and 29:

As per Claim 13, Muret et al., Obata et al., and Pettersen, and Proctor disclose the method according to claim 12, wherein at least one of said any number of a plurality of data fields is extracted from said log file **[(lines 20-26, Col. 6 from Muret et al.)]**.

Art Unit: 2135

As per Claim 29, the rejection of Claim 28 is incorporated. In addition, Claim 29 encompasses limitations that are similar to those of Claim 13. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against Claim 13 above.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's amendments, filed on Apr. 24, 2007, have Claims 4-5, 9-10, 20-21, and 25-26 amended. All other claims are as original.
11. Applicant's remark, filed on Apr. 24, 2007, argues Obata fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations, and one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Muret in view of Obata since the teachings of these respective references are non-analogous to one another for Claim 1.
12. Applicant's remark, filed on Apr. 23, 2007, argues that Muret does not teach or suggest that web pages comprising a non-visible link for Claim 2, and modification by combining Obata and Muret is nonsensical for Claim 16.
13. Applicant's remark, filed on Apr. 23, 2007, further argues that Examiner fails to establish prima facie case of obvious which would have motivated one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the various cited prior art for various dependent claims.
14. Applicant's remark has been fully considered, but found not persuasive based on the reason below.

Regarding to Argument (1):

In response to Applicant's argument that Muret and Obata is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for

rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Muret teaches monitoring and analyzing internet traffic so as to handle the busiest websites on the Internet. Obata, on the other hand, teaches the method of retrieving information, particularly the document information, from the network sites. The combination of the two prior art would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made since one would have been motivated to optimize a Web crawler's use of computer resources when performing adaptive incremental Web crawls to maintain the synchronization (lines 4-7 of [0010] from Obata et al.) especially in the internet/network environment. That is, the retrieval of data information from website on the internet/network may be processed in a fast manner by having the crawler involved. Therefore, the two cited prior art, contrary to Applicant's argument, is not nonanalogous and is within the same field of endeavor.

Regarding to Argument (2):

In regards to Applicant's argument that Muret does not teach or suggest that web pages comprising a non-visible link for Claim 2, and modification by combining Obata and Muret is nonsensical for Claim 16, Examiner respectively disagrees. First of all, it is not clearly as what the Applicant mean as "the non-visible link" claimed in Claim 2. In this instance, the cited disclosure described the interactive report made of HTML and javascript code for loading the application and icons.

Therefore, the icons on the report, in the form of javascript and html code, represent a non-visible link (see lines 45-53 and 65-67, Col. 20 and line 1, Col. 21 from Muret et al.). As for Claim 16, Examiner would like to state that Obata and Muret is not nonanalogous (see above argument (1)). Therefore, it is not nonsensical to combine Muret and Obata.

Regarding to Argument (3):

15. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references to establish prima facie case of obvious which would have motivated one having ordinary skill in the art to do so, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Muret teaches monitoring and analyzing internet traffic so as to handle the busiest websites on the Internet, Obata teaches the method of retrieving information on a computer network, particularly the document information, Pettersen teaches the web page content code and access to the constructed dynamic web page, Meyerzon teaches retrieving information pertaining to electronic document on a computer network, and Proctor teaches managing of security incidents in the network

computing environment. Anyone having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be able to make various combinations of the above references since they are related to the network/internet management, processing, and data retrieval. Therefore, prima facie case of obvious has been established based on the motivation provided in the above rejections.

Based on the reason above, it is believed that the rejection to the claims should be maintained. Applicant is reminded that additional modification to clarify the claimed limitation is necessary for further consideration.

Conclusion

16. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

- a. Torii et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0116631) discloses the system includes the monitor agent that analyzes log of an entity. When an abnormality is detected, the monitor agent notifies about the abnormality to the control manager. The control manager decides a countermeasure and a countermeasure request party from the database and informs them to the action agent which the countermeasure request party. The action agent implements the countermeasure.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yin-Chen Shaw whose telephone number is 571-272-8593. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 4:30 M-F. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100